

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,117		09/29/2001	Robert D. Dickinson III	TUMB-102 CON2	9177
26137	7590	06/01/2004		EXAM	INER
PATENT			CALLAHAN, PAUL E		
SKADDEN FOUR TIM		SLATE, MEAGHER ARE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	NEW YORK, NY 10036			2137	1,
				DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004	4 /C

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		lacksquare
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
, <b>)</b>	09/967,117	DICKINSON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Paul Callahan	2137
The MAILING DATE of this communicat	ion appears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA:  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	TION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, ation.  ys, a reply within the statutory minimun y period will apply and will expire SIX (or statute, cause the application to bec	may a reply be timely filed  n of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
	- 40 November 2002	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed o	n <u>10 November 2003</u> . ⊠ This action is non-final.	
		matters prosecution as to the merits is
<ol> <li>Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice up</li> </ol>		
	maon Ex panto quayro, 100	<b>3.3.1.1,</b> 1.3. 3.3.1.1.1.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the appl		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w	vithdrawn from consideratio	n.
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requiremer	nt.
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		ed to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection		
		awing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a laim for a	foreign priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority doc	uments have been received	d.
2. Certified copies of the priority doc	uments have been received	d in Application No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		
application from the International	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	•
* See the attached detailed Office action for	r a list of the certified copie	s not received.
Attachment(s)	[7]	nian Current (PTO 442)
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-</li> </ol>		rview Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date
Notice of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8,9,14.	0/SB/08) 5) ☐ Noti	ce of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) er:
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)	Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 15

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/967,117

Art Unit: 2137

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11-10-2003 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 1-26 were pending in this case as of the mailing of the previous Office Action. New claims 27 and 28 have been added by the latest amendment. Claims 1-28 have been examined.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 7, 16, 17, 18, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims each contain the limitation of "...an e-mail firewall associated with an organization..." It is unclear what the Applicant intends the term "Organization" to encompass or how the term limits the claim in any way since any firewall may be associated with an organization simply by virtue of the necessity of use of an ISP for Internet connectivity.

Claims 8-28 are dependent on claims 7, 18, and 25 and are therefore rejected on the same basis as those claims.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

Application/Control Number: 09/967,117

Art Unit: 2137

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield, US Patent 5,632,011, Bruce Schneier: Applied cryptography 2nd Edition, Oct. 1995, John Wiley & Sons Pub., and Aziz, US Patent 5,416,842.

As per claim 1, Landfield teaches a method for transmitting a message between a sender user associated with a first email firewall and a recipient user associated with a second e-mail firewall, the method comprising: intercepting a plurality of packets associated with a message from the sender user intended for the recipient user (abstract); said data packets generated by a process outside of said first e-mail firewall (fig. 1); assembling said data packets to an application level message (col. 4 lines 18-21) searching an encryption directory for an entry associated with the second e-mail firewall associated with the recipient user (col. 4 lines 25-45); retrieving an encryption key associated with the second e-mail firewall, the second firewall associated with a plurality of recipient users; encoding the assembled message and allowing the message to proceed through the firewall (fig 2a, b, c) to the recipient user. Landfield does not explicitly teach encrypting with an encryption key associated with the second e-mail firewall to provide an encrypted message, however Aziz does teach this step (Abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Landfield. It would be desirable to do so as this would increase the security of the communications system.

As per claim 2, Landfield does not explicitly teach encoding the message is by employing an encryption key that is stored locally by the first e-mail firewall however such is taught implicitly by fig. 2c items 52 and 54 where a message is received in encrypted form.

Application/Control Number: 09/967,117

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 3 -5, Landfield does not teach encoding the message is by employing an encryption key that is retrieved from an external server over a secure data link that employs a locally stored encryption key associated with the external server. However Schneier teaches such, pages 185-187: "Public Key Management" Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature of Schneier into the system of Landfield. It would have been desirable to do so as this would decrease storage overhead at the firewall.

As per claim 6, Landfield teaches a method for receiving a message from a sender user associated with a first e-mail firewall by a recipient user associated with a second e-mail firewall, and ultimately allowing the message to proceed through the firewall to the recipient user, but does not teach the first e-mail firewall encoding the message by using an encryption key of the second e-mail firewall, comprising: intercepting the message; by the second e-mail firewall; decoding the message with a private key of the second e-mail firewall. Schneier does teach these steps at pages 31-33 and 185-187. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature of Schneier into the system of Landfield. It would have been desirable to do so as this would decrease storage overhead at the firewall.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (703) 305-1336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Morse, can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (703) 872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/967,117

Art Unit: 2137

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

5-28-2004

Paul Callahan